

From: Sue Warner/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
Sent: 12/23/2011 1:49:16 PM
To: Stevie Wilding/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
CC:
Subject: Fw: contact for today

Stevie,

Just to keep you up to date on Dimock.

Sue

----- Forwarded by Sue Warner/ESC/R3/USEPA/US on 12/23/2011 01:47 PM -----

From: Sue Warner/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
To: Richard Rupert/R3/USEPA/US
Cc: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/23/2011 09:40 AM
Subject: Re: contact for today

Rich,

Answers to questions 2 ,3 and 7 are in red below.

Sue

From: Richard Rupert/R3/USEPA/US
To: Sue Warner/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/23/2011 08:45 AM
Subject: Re: contact for today

Here are the questions from our contractor. Please ignore those questions that do not concern Ft Meade.

thanks

Rich,

We have several questions relating to the sample analysis for the Dimock Residential Groundwater Site.

1. According to Bill Huggins, Mike Eller of the EPA Water Protection Division arranged for analytical services with Isotech Laboratories to analyze the samples for isotopic analysis during the Chesapeake Atgas Site. If EPA could contact Isotech and set this up again it may save money and time since it appears EPA has an account with Isotech already. Please let us know if you want us to proceed with Isotech lab procurement or if you think EPA should set it up.
2. Mercury analysis was included in Draft Fort Meade Table sent to us by Rich Rupert, but was omitted from the final Fort Meade Table. Please clarify if Ft. Meade will analyze for mercury (which they should be able to do). We had thought that mercury analysis may not be necessary, but we will analyze for mercury as requested.
3. There is a question on the Fort Meade Table on whether nitrate/nitrite analysis should be combined or separated. Please let us know if you want them combined or separated. Combined
4. Does it make sense to have EPA's NAREL (National Air and Radiation Environmental Laboratory) perform the radchem? This would save money and time if an EPA lab could perform the analysis.
5. Please provide, or have Ft. Meade provide the DAS Case Number once it is assigned to the project.
6. Two of the parameters we were requested to analyze for (2-methylnaphthalene and 2-methoxyglycol) would probably show up as TICs in the SVOA analysis. Do you want us to attempt to get a lab to analyze for only those

compounds?

7. A question for Fort Meade...which of the parameters can be combined into the same bottles? Also, they have listed the volume of water for specific parameters. For ease of sample jar procurement I would propose we order standard size sample jars (500 ml jars vs 400 ml jars) as they are more prominent and easier to acquire. Is this OK? If you would like us to coordinate directly with Fort Meade, please let me know and we will initiate that correspondence. You can use 500 mL as a standard size jar. You can: combine all metals, including mercury and hardness; combine all anions; separate containers for TSS and TDS; combine pH and alkalinity; combine total phosphorus, nitrate/nitrite and total nitrogen; separate containers for VOCs, SVOCs, FTIR, HPLC and GC.

8. Aside from the quick turn-around-time (TAT) for the parameters provided by Rich Rupert today, do you have a desired TAT for the lab to provide us the data, and for the ESAT validators to provide the validated data?

9. We did some preliminary research on bacteria testing. We found that a couple of the labs had a 6-hour hold time for the bacteria tests. If we analyze for bacteria, we may need to find a local lab and set up a courier service to drive the samples to the lab to meet the 6 hour hold time. Does EPA want TechLaw to proceed in securing analytical services and the associated logistical arrangements to analyze samples for bacteria?

Richard Rupert
On-Scene Coordinator
U.S.EPA
1650 Arch Street - 3HS31
Philadelphia, PA 19103
rupert.richard@epa.gov